DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 534 CG 007 070

AUTHOR Useem, Elizabeth
TITLE Correlates of Racial Attitudes Among White High School Students.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association Chicago, Illinois, April 3-7, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; *Bus Transportation; Educational Experience; Ethnic Status; Group Status; *High School Students; School Buses; *School Integration; Schools; Secondary Schools; Social Integration; Social Status; *Socioeconomic Status; *Status; Status Need; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

White tenth graders in eight tokenly desegregated suburban high schools comprised the sample. A number of hypotheses were tested, all of which examine aspects of the relationship between racial attitudes and three sets of independent variables; (1) the ascribed roles and statuses which white students bring with them into the school setting; (2) the statuses he achieves within that context; and (3) the totality of his inter-racial experiences. The single major dependent variable was the students' attitudes toward a busing program which transported black students to their schools. Results show: (1) that white students who experienced equal status contact with blacks prior to the busing program and those who associated with the bused students in school activities were more likely to have positive feelings about the busing program; and (2) contact with bused students in the classroom was not related to tolerant attitudes. In general, the evidence supports the contention that the negative effects of status factors are stronger than the positive effects of cross-racial association. (TL)

ED 061534

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CORRELATES OF RACIAL ATTITUDES AMONG WHITE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS*

Elizabeth Useem

Boston State College

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: CG
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. UD

N-NPD

For a number of years liberal educators and policymakers have looked to school desegregation as a potential mechanism for the reduction of racial prejudice and intergroup conflict. It was hoped that as a result of the racial integration of schools, not only would the academic standing and sense of self-worth of the black students improve, but the feelings of racial tolerance on the part of white students toward blacks would increase as well. There was a widespread assumption that interracial contact in schools would be effective in reducing racial prejudice when certain conditions, outlined by Allport (1954), were present--where the two racial groups were of equal status, were pursuing common goals and shared common interests, and had the backing of laws, customs and local officials. Unfortunately, however, there has been little systematic research exploring the degree to which cross-racial association in schools actually leads to the development of positive racial attitudes among whites. Researchers have also generally neglected to study the effects on attitudes of other variables, such as a student's social class or academic standing, which might either reinforce or counter the assumed positive relationship between intergroup contact and racial tolerance. It is possible that the forces operating to produce prejudiced attitudes among students may in fact be stronger than the potentially favorable influence of interracial contact.

In general, the few empirical studies of the racial attitudes of white students that have been reported have been limited in two important respects: 1) they have failed to utilize multivariate statistical methods that enable the researcher to identify the independent effects of one factor on racial feelings while simultaneously controlling for the effects of other variables; and 2) they have included only a limited set of independent variables associated with racial attitudes--generally age, sex, and the percentage of black students in the school.

CG 007 070

---

*Paper delivered at the annual meetings of The American Educational Research Association, April, 1972, Chicago, Illinois.

Research among white adults indicates that there are many factors which affect their racial attitudes and that in order to determine the influence of one factor on attitudes, a number of other variables must be held constant. However, most studies published to date concerning students' attitudes have not used statistical controls, and those significant and relevant researches which have done so (e.g., U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967, a reanalysis of the Coleman Report (1966) data; Chadwick, et al., 1970) have not included several important variables in their models. In particular, they have not examined the relationship between students' academic status in school, i.e., their grades or ability group placement, and their racial attitudes. The little research that has been done in this field has generally focused on the ways in which students' ascribed statuses (usually social class, age, and sex) and the degree of their cross-racial contact in school affects their racial attitudes. There has been virtually complete failure to examine the relationships between white students' statuses within school and their feelings toward their black schoolmates.

When analyzing racial attitudes of individuals within a specific institutional setting, it would seem essential to examine the relationship between those attitudes and three sets of independent variables: 1) the ascribed roles and statuses the individual brings with him to that setting; 2) the statuses which he achieves to some extent on his own in that particular context; and 3) the degree to which the individual experiences interracial contact both inside and outside of the setting under scrutiny and the conditions under which that contact occurs. The explanation for racial intolerance, like all other social phenomena, is complex and it is likely in the case of most people that while some factors are encouraging them to develop positive racial attitudes, other factors are pushing them in the opposite direction.

It is hypothesized here that white students who rank low on various ascribed and achieved status dimensions would resent the relative academic and social gains made by black students in recent years and would thus be more likely to express hostile feelings toward these students. Sepcifically, the prediction is that socially marginal white students--marginal either in socioeconomic status (SES) or academic standing or perhaps even in social popularity among peers in school--would be more racially prejudiced than their white schoolmates whose standing in such stratification hierarchies was higher. It is also hypothesized that feelings of relative deprivation and hence prejudiced attitudes would be especially acute among lower status white males whose social position as a group

could be viewed as being threatened further in schools where black males appeared to be relatively popular with white females and successful in athletics.

On the other hand, it was felt that equal status interracial contact outside of school (in the neighborhood, in church, etc.) and some forms of interracial association in school would be correlated with positive attitudes toward blacks, and that the effects of such contact would to some extent counter the inimical influences on attitudes of low socioeconomic and academic status and low popularity among peers. However, not all types of interracial association in school are necessarily expected to facilitate interracial harmony. One could reasonably argue that cross-racial association in the personally competitive arena of the classroom violates the condition that the two racial groups must be working for a common goal, a condition that Allport claimed must be present in order for interracial contact to reduce prejudiced attitudes. Conversely, one would expect that intergroup contact in extracurricular activities where students would be more likely to be working toward common goals would be associated with more positive racial attitudes. Perhaps these hypotheses which contend that the effects on attitudes of intergroup contact in school vary depending on the school context in which it occurs help explain why Carithers (1970) in her recent review of desegregation research found that previous research results on the relationship between interracial association in school and racial attitudes are ambiguous. Another cause for these ambiguous findings, as Carithers notes, is that various forms of intergroup contact may have a positive influence on the racial feelings of some social groupings of students but not on others. At any rate, it is hypothesized that even though certain interracial contact experiences might lead students to develop positive racial feelings, other experiences, such as coming from a less advantaged social class background or having a low academic standing in school might be correlated with intolerance and could in fact have a greater effect than contact on racial attitudes. It is argued that the assumption of some policymakers and researchers that school desegregation will increase white students' racial tolerance overlooks both the variety of contact environments existing within even one school and the degree to which other factors, some of them encouraged by the structure and functions of the schools themselves, strongly impel many students to retain or develop prejudiced attitudes toward their black schoolmates.

In order to examine these hypotheses, a racial attitude survey was administered in May, 1969, to a sample of white suburban high school students who attended schools where there is token racial desegregation. The sample was drawn from

eight schools which participated in a busing program that transported low and middle income black children daily from a large northern city to schools in surrounding suburbs of relative affluence.

Research Methods

The Sample

The population under scrutiny in the study was white tenth graders in the nine suburban senior high schools where black students were bused in 1968-69. The decision was made to limit the respondents to students in the tenth grade for several reasons: focusing on one grade only would eliminate the need to control for and examine the effects of age and grade level on individuals' racial attitudes, thus freeing the researcher to concentrate on the relationships among more important variables; the largest percentage of the bused high school students was concentrated in this grade; and the tenth grade was the only grade that had bused students in it in every one of the senior high schools. A total of 240 black students were bused to these schools from the inner city during the 1968-69 academic year. The busing program had been operating in four of these schools for three years, in three of these schools for two years, and in two of these schools for one year only.

One of the schools refused to participate in the survey, so the study was carried out in only eight schools. Of the eight schools that cooperated in the study, four of them had tenth grades whose size ranged from about 330 to 450 students, and the tenth grades of the four other schools ranged in size from approximately 550-700 students. To insure that adequate and representative numbers of students from each of the eight schools would be included in the study, a random sample in each of the eight schools was sought that was roughly proportional to the size of the tenth grade in that school. Therefore, in the four schools with the smaller tenth grades, a sample of 120 students was drawn, and in the four schools with the larger tenth grades, a sample of 180 students was selected. The specific students in the sample were randomly selected from tenth grade class lists supplied by the schools. Overall, a sample of 1200 students (out of a total population of approximately 4000 tenth graders) was asked to fill out a forty minute self-administering racial attitude questionnaire. Of those 1200 students who were selected to participate in the survey, 1042 actually filled out the questionnaire--a response rate of 87 percent. (For further details on this issue, see Useem (1971).)

Definition of Variables

There was a single major dependent variable in the study: the attitudes of the sample of white tenth graders toward the busing program which transported black students to their schools. An index of white students' attitudes was constructed based on their responses to a series of eight Likert items plus one other item.[1] The items included statements designed to elicit students' feeling about the program in general (e.g., "the busing program should be continued," "there should be more black students bused to this high school") as well as their attitudes toward the students in the program (e.g., "the black students are privileged to come out here and get a good education and they should be thankful for the opportunity," "the black students are too preoccupied and self-conscious about their race"). White students' attitudes toward the busing program itself were inextricably tied up with their feelings about the bused students themselves and thus the scale measures both.

The primary independent variables were those family background and school related characteristics and experiences of individual students which were expected to be related to prejudiced attitudes. One group of independent variables consisted of students' ascriptive roles and statuses: sex, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and religious background. In order to get some estimate of the socioeconomic status of a students family, students were given three closed choice questions which asked them to indicate the educational attainment of their mothers and fathers and the fathers' occupations. On the latter item, the respondent not only circled one of the nine occupational categories listed, but also (as a check)

---

1. The following Likert type items (followed here by their principal components factor loadings) made up the scale:

1. The busing program should be continued. (.83)
2. The black students are privileged to come out here and get a good education, and they should be thankful for this opportunity. (.51)
3. If the black students who are bused here don't like it in this school, then they should go to schools in their own communities. (.58)
4. There should be more black students bused to this high school. (.83)
5. If black students are going to be bused out here to our schools, then they should live up to our standards of behavior and obey school rules. (.53)
6. Having black students bused to our school will cause the quality of education we get here to go down. (.64)
7. The black students are too preoccupied and self-conscious about their race. (.53)
8. It is good for the black students to have a strong sense of unity and racial pride. (.49)

Also included was the item, "On the whole, how favorable are you toward the busing program?" (.79) Response categories for this item were "very favorable," "somewhat favorable," and "not favorable." The questions formed a scale with a reliability coefficient (Kuder-Richardson formula 20) of .80.

wrote down the name of his father's job and roughly described what he did on the job.[2] An overall SES scale was devised for each individual by combining in equal measure the scores of the corrected closed choice father's occupation item and the measures of parental education which together represented three dimensions of family SES.[3]

Students were also asked if either of their parents or grandparents had come to the United States from another country and, if so, what the country or countries were. This open-ended question was the only measure of ethnicity in the study. Answers were coded in nine categories corresponding to various countries or regions. Similarly, students were asked to indicate their religious background. Responses were coded as Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or "Other."

Another set of independent variables concerns students' statuses in school which, in contast to the ascriptive statuses just described, they have achieved by themselves to some degree.[4] These variables include academic status, i.e., grades and relative placement in the ability grouping system, and social standing among peers in school. The grades and ability group assignments of students were obtained directly from school records. Students' final course grades from their tenth grade year were averaged and coded as "mostly A's," "mostly A's and B's," "mostly B's," and so on. The coding of ability grouping placements was more difficult, particularly because most students were in different ability levels for different subjects. The schools varied in the number of ability grouping "levels" they employed (most school had four), but for the purposes of this analysis, respondents were classified in one of three categories: 1) honors or advanced placement; 2) college preparatory--no honors or advanced placement; and 3) non-college preparatory or general. A student was classified as an honors or

---

2. This open-ended question proved to be a valuable check on students' responses to the closed choice question on fathers' occupation. In one of the schools chosen at random, students' open-ended descriptions of their fathers' occupations indicated that 26 percent of them had circled the wrong occupational category in the forced choice item.

3. The coefficient of reliability (Kuder-Richardson formula 20) for this scale is .80.

4. These are variables which are considered here to be related to individuals' background characteristics but which are not totally assigned at birth. The author agrees with Gouldner (1970:322) that "the difficulty with using the achievement-ascription distinction is that rewards that are allocated on the basis of achievement often depend upon prior differential opportunities, which might not have depended upon achievement."

advanced placement student if he was in one or more courses with that label. If a student had a mixed program of college and non-college courses, he was generally considered a non-college student.[5]

Some attempt was made to determine a student's position in the social hierarchies of the school. One traditional arena of social accomplishment for students has been in a school's extracurricular activities. Previous researchers (Hollingshead, 1949; Coleman, 1961; Spady, 1970) have noted that those who are active in extracurricular school affairs tend to be more popular among their classmates. Students in the sample were asked to indicate those school activities in which they had participated during the school year (e.g., athletic teams, cheerleaders, band or orchestra, student government, political or social action groups). A simple summary scale was constructed in which students were given one point for each activity they participated in, and in the actual data analysis the number of categories was collapsed to five. Students were also asked to estimate how well liked, known, and respected they were compared to their classmates. Their responses to these questions were combined to form an index of perceived social status.[6] This is not a very good measure of a student's popularity among his peers because it is based on a student's own perceptions and not the real feelings of his peers. Spady (1970) found that there was a rather weak relationship (r=.22) between a student's perceived social status and his actual popularity among his classmates.

A third series of variables dealt with the degree to which the white students had experienced equal status contact with blacks in general. The respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they had come into contact with blacks on a regular basis in the past in a variety of contexts such as in elementary school, in their neighborhood, at summer camp, church, on a job, or in a youth group. Another scale concerned the extent of classroom contact between black and white students. Students were asked to indicate the number of classes they had had with the bused black students in previous years as well as during the current

---

5. If a student with a mixed program of college and non-college courses had a grade average above a C, had aspirations for at least some college work, and indicated on the questionnaire that he was a college preparatory student, then he was categorized in the college preparatory group; otherwise, students with mixed programs were classified as non-college preparatory students. There were very few students in the sample whose entire curriculum consisted of courses at the non-college or general level.

6. The coefficient of reliability (Kuder-Richardson formula 20) for this scale is .68.

school year. A second index of white students' contact with the bused students dealt with association in extracurricular activities. Those white respondents who had met or worked with black students in any school-connected activity listed those activities on the questionnaire. In the actual data analysis, each of the three interracial contact scales was collapsed to five categories whose values ranged from "no contact" to "extensive contact."

The results of this study are limited in their generalizability to all desegregated schools since the number of black students in the schools was so small (the percentage of nonwhite students in the schools varied from 0.2 percent to 3.6 percent). Also the conclusiveness of the results with regard to causality is somewhat weak since the data were collected at only one point in time. Nevertheless, the results of such correlational analysis are interesting and auggestive of paths which could be explored later with more complex research designs.

Findings: Predictors of Racial Attitudes

Multiple regression analyses based on both the entire sample and the eight school subsamples are reported along with the results of several multi-way crosstabulation analyses that reveal certain interactions among the variables. The findings will be presented by discussing separately the effects of each of the independent variables on white students' attitudes toward the busing program.

a) Sex

White males expressed significantly greater hostility toward the black students than white females.[7] Forty-three percent of the males had less favorable attitudes toward the program compared to only 28 percent of the females (Table 1). More importantly, sex exerts a statistically significant and independent effect on these attitudes even when a number of other variables are taken into account. In the overall multiple regression analyses whose structure and results are presented in Table 2, sex had a standardized (beta) coefficient of .18. This result is consistent with previous research findings that although female students tend to be more ethnocentric than male students in their choice of friends

---

7. An idea of the attitudes of the overall sample toward the busing program can be gained by looking at responses to selected items in the scale: only 11 percent of the respondents said they were "not favorable" to the program, and 74 percent felt the busing should be continued. However, only 52 percent believed that a greater number of black students should be included in the program.

(Lundberg and Dickson, 1952a,b; Campbell and Yarrow, 1958; Gottlieb and Ten Houten, 1965; Parsons, 1965; Gordon, 1966; Porter, 1971), they generally have more tolerant racial attitudes (Williams, 1955; Singer, 1966, 1967; Dentler and Elkins, 1967). Some researchers (e.g., Williams, 1964) claim that females express greater tolerance because they tend to be more sensitive to personal and social relationships than males.

[Tables 1 and 2 about here.]

Perhaps another explanation for females' greater tolerance in this case is that black male students seem to represent a greater threat to the status of white male students than black girls represent to the status of white girls. Several researchers (Campbell and Yarrow, 1958; Pettigrew, 1969; Carithers, 1970; Porter, 1971) have noted that black males tend to be socially accepted more easily in integrated school settings than black females because there are avenues of achievement and status open to them that are not open to their female counterparts. In particular, the status of black males is partially determined by their achievements in sports and other school activities while black females are judged, like white females, in large part by their physical appearance. Since white standards of beauty still predominate, black girls are denied access to status on this crucial dimension. Because of this they are not a group which appears to threaten the status of white females. The results of Armor's (1972) study of the black students in this particular busing program indicate that the boys were more likely than the girls to be involved in school activities, to date a white student, and to mix with white students during their free time in school. It would seem, therefore, that the social status of white males as a group is threatened by black males and thus white males could be expected to express greater hostility toward the black students than white females.

b) Ethnicity and Religion

There is no clearcut pattern of results with regard to the relationship between ethnic and religious identity on the one hand and racial attitudes on the other. While there is a significant tendency for Jewish and "Other" students (mostly Unitarians, agnostics, and atheists) and those from Russian and Eastern European ethnic backgrounds to express more favorable racial attitudes than other groups of students (Tables 3 and 4), the effects of these factors are reduced once other relevant variables are taken into account. The beta coefficients

TABLE 1. Attitude Toward the Busing Program by Sex

		Sex		
		Male	Female	
Favorable Attitudes Toward Busing Program	High[a]	30.6%	39.7%	
	Medium	26.4	32.3	
	Low	43.0	28.1	
	N	516	524	Total N= 1040

$x^2 = 25.59$ $p < .01$

[a]These categories indicate only relative differences in attitudes. The respondents are divided into three groups ("high," "medium," or "low") of equal size according to their score on the scale of attitudes toward the busing program.

TABLE 2. Unique Contributions of Students' Ascribed and Achieved Statuses and Interracial Contact To Attitudes Toward the Busing Program

School	N	Standardized (Beta) Coefficients[b]								
		Ability Group Placement	SES	Sex[c]	Prior Interracial Contact	Grade Average	Jewish[d]	Catholic[d]	Protestant[d]	Other[d]
A	100	.10	-.01	.05	.29**	.28**				.32**
B	157	.00	.11	.30**	.12	.09		-.28**	.21*	
C	160	-.03	.38**	.19**	.10	.10				
D	104	.15	.18	.10	.20*					
E	106	.20	.26**	.21*	.00	-.10			.20*	-.25**
F	105	.50**	-.07	.15	.06				-.14	
G	160	.13	.10	.18**	.11	.14	.12			
H	150	.31**	.18*	.09	.10	.12				.13
Aggregate[a]	1042	.16**	.16**	.18**	.12**	.10**	.08*			.05

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level or less.

TABLE 2--Continued

School	Standardized (Beta) Coefficients[b]							R^2
	Russian-Eastern European[d]	Southern European[d]	Irish[d]	Perceived Social Status	Activities Scale	Classroom Contact	Activities Contact	
A		-.07				-.10		.43
B						-.12		.21
C	.09	.13					.14	.24
D		.13	-.10	-.15			.15	.18
E						-.08		.24
F	.16				-.11		.11	.35
G					.17*		-.10	.25
H			-.11	-.08				.32
Aggregate							.05	.18

[a]All variables in the overall regression except sex, ethnicity, and religion have been standardized to adjust for variations between schools.

[b]The beta coefficients were derived from multiple regressions in which the following options were specified:

TABLE 2--Continued

---

the first four variables listed above were "forced" into the equation and the variables which were chosen after the first four were selected according to the stepwise "best prediction" criterion--i.e., the next variable entered is that which has the maximum partial correlation with the dependent variable relative to the independent variables that are already in the equation at that point; and a maximum of eight variables was entered into the regressions. The first four factors were "forced" into the equations because preliminary results had indicated they were important predictors in most of the schools; it is useful to compare their weights from school to school. A maximum of eight variables was imposed because it was apparent from earlier analyses that the inclusion of more variables added less than .01 to the R^2.

[c]male=1, female=0 Coefficients with a positive sign mean that females have more positive attitudes than males. All ordinal variables are coded so that the higher the number, the lower the score on that variable.

[d]The particular group in question is coded as 0, others equal 1. A positive coefficient means the group has more positive attitudes toward the busing program than others. Furthermore, in cases where coefficients are reported, the n's upon which they are based equal a minimum of nine percent of the base n for each school. The only exception to this is the variable "Russian-Eastern European" where the n's are only four to five percent of the base n's of Schools C and F.

in Table 2 reveal that there is a significant tendency only for Jewish students to have more positive attitudes toward the busing program but this relationship is not a strong one. No one ethnic or religious group has a strong and consistent propensity to have either positive or negative attitudes. There is evidence from prior research (Hadden, 1969; Greeley, 1969; Campbell, 1971; Greeley and Sheatsley, 1971) that Jews, many of whom have a Russian or Eastern European ethnic background, have more favorable attitudes toward blacks than members of other religious and ethnic groups.[8] On the whole, however, research findings on the association between ethnic and religious identification and racial attitudes are ambiguous, partly because most researchers fail to control for the contaminating effects of socioeconomic status. Also, it could be that as various ethnic groups have become assimilated into American society to varying degrees, the influence and salience of that identity for its members has diminished somewhat.[9]

[Tables 3 and 4 about here.]

c) Socioeconomic Status (SES)

Analysis of the data revealed that the higher a student's social class background, the more positive were his attitudes toward the busing program.[10]

---

8. It should be noted that Greeley (1969), Campbell (1971), and Greeley and Sheatsley (1971) found that in general Polish-Americans (whose numbers are too small to be treated as a separate group in the study reported here) hold significantly more prejudiced views against blacks than other Protestant and Catholic ethnic groups although Greeley claimed that this is not true of Polish-Americans who live on the East Coast. Greeley and Sheatsley (1971:18) conclude from their national survey that "there seems to be no evidence of racism among white ethnics except in the Slavic Catholic group. To the extent that a backlash exists even in that group, it seems to be concentrated among the less educated people. The other three Catholic ethnic groups are, if anything, even more integrationist than the typical Northern Protestant white--although less so than the typical Northern Jew."

9. Research by Abramson and Noll (1966) revealed that the racial attitudes of Catholics who come from a pure ethnic background (i.e., neither they nor their parents had married someone from another ethnic group) are not affected by increased class position but that higher social class status is correlated with greater tolerance among those Catholics from mixed ethnic backgrounds. This suggests that for some groups ethnicity exerts a greater influence than SES on racial attitudes.

10. It is important to keep in mind that these are relatively affluent communities. Thus, "lower" social class here refers in general to children whose fathers have graduated from high school and who have fairly well paying working class jobs such as craftsmen or foremen.

TABLE 3 Attitudes Toward The Busing Program by Religion

		Religion				
		Catholic	Protestant	Jew	"Other"[a]	
Favorable Attitudes Toward Busing Program	High	29.5%	31.1%	54.5%	50.6%	
	Medium	27.7	35.3	22.7	23.6	
	Low	42.8	33.6	22.7	25.8	
	N	444	360	132	89	Total N= 1025

$x^2 = 48.96$ $p < .01$

[a]"Other" primarily includes Unitarians, atheists, and agnostics.

TABLE 4 Attitudes Toward Busing Program by Ethnicity

		Ethnicity[a]							
		Irish	Russian-Eastern European	Southern European	Canadian	British, Scandinavian, Western European	Other	Non-Ethnics	
Favorable Attitudes Toward Busing Program	High	34.2%	52.9%	18.5%	38.1%	44.4%	32.4%	31.0%	
	Medium	19.3	25.5	43.7	19.0	21.8	32.4	33.2	
	Low	46.5	21.6	37.8	42.9	33.9	35.3	35.8	
	N	114	153	119	63	124	34	416	Total N= 1023

$x^2 = 61.77 \quad p < .01$

[a]A student was considered to be from a particular ethnic group if he had a parent or grandparent born in that country or region.

The zero order correlation between the two scales is .25 (significant at the .01 level). Furthermore, a significant relationship held up between the two variables in the multiple regression analysis--the standardized regression coefficient from the overall regression was .16. This result is in line with the findings of many other researchers who have documented the existence of a strong positive relationship between social class background and racial tolerance (Allport and Kramer, 1946; Tumin, 1958; Stember, 1961; Williams, 1964; Noel and Pinkney, 1964; Abramson and Noll, 1966, Selznick and Steinberg, 1969; Porter, 1971; Greeley and Sheatsley, 1971), particularly when social class is defined in terms of educational attainment.[11] This association could be accounted for in several ways: increased educational attainment has a liberalizing effect on people's attitudes; higher SES people are more likely than others to disguise their true racial feelings because they are conscious of liberal social norms; and, most importantly, those from higher status backgrounds do not have to compete directly with blacks for the scarce economic and social rewards made available to laboring people by those with economic and political power. Because blacks tend to be directly beneath the white working class in the stratification hierarchy, this group of whites is probably more susceptible to feelings of relative deprivation when blacks appear to be making some advances. And these feelings can lead to racial antagonisms as Riley and Pettigrew (1969) have documented.

d) Academic Status--Grades and Ability Group Placement

Students with higher academic status have more positive attitudes toward the busing program. The correlation between a student's grade average and his score on a scale of attitudes toward the busing program was .24, and the correlation between his ability group placement (Honors-College-Non-College) and those attitudes was .29--both relationships were significant at the .01 level. However, these two variables are significantly related to a student's SES (the relationship between grade average and SES is .26 and that between ability grouping and SES is .36), and thus the question arises as to whether or not the two factors exert an influence on racial attitudes once SES is controlled. The results of the multiple regression analyses indicate that in fact a student's grade average and his ability

---

11. Several studies have found that racial prejudice is less prevalent among people in higher occupational status categories (Tumin, 1958; Martin and Westie, 1959; Williams, 1964), but contradictory findings have also been reported (Hunt, 1959-60; Young et al., 1960; Campbell, 1971).

group placement have a significant independent effect even after SES and other variables are taken into account. A student's position in the ability grouping system is more strongly associated with his attitudes to the busing program than is his grade average. The beta coefficients for the whole sample are .16 and .10 respectively. These results support Lombardi's (1963) findings that students whose scholastic averages went from passing to failing in a nine-month period after token desegregation was implemented were more likely than other students to develop negative racial attitudes.

The development of feelings of relative deprivation among white students in racially desegregated schools is probably enhanced when there is only token integration, particularly if the black students are bused in from another area and are considered "underprivileged." The fact that a small number of black students are bused in as a group to a school heightens their visibility and identification as a special group. It also increases the probability that teachers and staff members in those schools where liberal norms predominate will give them special treatment and extra attention. Furthermore, white students in middle class suburban schools most likely have been conditioned to expect that they will academically outperform black children from inner city ghettos.

Furthermore, it is plausible that those white students who are insecure as a result of holding a low position in the school's academic stratification hierarchy are likely to feel even more threatened when they are faced with unanticipated competition from black students. Because they may be frustrated by their own academic "failure" in school, these whites may direct their hostility toward black students whom they perceive as having made greater relative gains than are deserved. Or, at the least, white students may feel that these black students are getting too much attention. Therefore, regardless of their social class backgrounds, white students who are "unsuccessful" in school academically (particularly the 17 percent in the non-college ability group in these eight schools) should be more likely than other pupils to express hostile attitudes toward their black schoolmates. On the other hand, honor students, who comprise 36 percent of the student body in the sample studied, are relatively insulated from academic competition from black students and from potential threats to their academic status, and this may account for their more positive racial attitudes toward blacks in their school.

In some respects the students who are bused appear to have a privileged status in the schools under study. More black students than white students

(70 percent compared to 50 percent in Armor's survey) felt that three or more of their teachers cared how well they did in school. About half of the white students sampled felt that some or more teachers gave preferential treatment in disciplinary matters to black students. Moreover, a very high percentage of black students who graduated in 1969 went on to college--77 percent (24 students) matriculated to four-year colleges, and only 13 percent went directly into the labor force. The percentage of black students going to four-year colleges is substantially higher than the percentage of white students, 55 percent, doing the same.

It is interesting to note the manner in which a student's ability group placement interacts with his social class background (when SES is trichotomized) to influence his attitudes toward the busing program (Table 5). The students who were most hostile to the black students were those who were low in SES and who were in the non-college group. However, the second most negative group were the students who might be considered most downwardly mobile--i.e., those from high SES families who were in the non-college ability group. It is noteworthy that their attitudes were less favorable than those of students who were only somewhat downwardly mobile (non-college students from medium SES homes). Those respondents who held the most positive racial attitudes were students who ranked high in SES and were in honors classes. They were followed by students who were sharply upwardly mobile (low SES and honors) and moderately downwardly mobile (high SES and college prep)--the latter two groups did not differ significantly in their attitudes. In general, these findings support the conclusions of Bettelheim and Janowitz (1950), Greenblum and Pearlin (1953), and Pettigrew (1958), that downward mobility is related to racial intolerance. However, it contradicts Greenblum and Pearlin's contention that upward mobility is related to racial intolerance.

[Table 5 about here.]

The respondents' mobility also appears to interact with their sex to influence racial feelings. In the data presented in Table 6, students are divided into four mobility groups by dichotomizing SES and a student's academic status, a scale which combines in equal measure both a student's grades and his ability group placement. It is apparent from the data that differences in racial attitudes by sex are stronger in certain groups than in others. For example, among those

TABLE 5. Attitudes Toward Busing Program by Ability Group and Socioeconomic Status[a]

Favorable Attitudes Toward Busing Program	Socioeconomic Status: High			Medium			Low		
	Ability Group			Ability Group			Ability Group		
	Honors	College Prep	Non-College	Honors	College Prep	Non-College	Honors	College Prep	Non-College
High	58.8%	42.8%	13.0%[b]	35.1%	27.7%	38.6%	40.5%	31.9%	7.8%
Medium	27.5	27.7	43.5	34.0	30.8	18.2	31.1	36.2	28.4
Low	13.7	29.5	43.5	30.9	41.5	43.2	28.4	31.9	63.7
	Gamma = .38			Gamma = .10			Gamma = .44		
N	204	173	23	97	159	44	74	160	102
							Total N = 1036		

[a]Both attitudes toward the busing program and SES have been standardized to adjust for differences between schools.

[b]Cell size too small (less than 5) for reliable percentaging.

high both in SES and academic status, females are only slightly more likely than males to have very positive feelings about the busing program. The differences in racial attitudes between the sexes become more pronounced among the downwardly mobile and upwardly mobile students but are most striking among students who are low in SES and academic status. In this group, 61 percent of the males have more negative attitudes compared to 35 percent of the females. It is clear that males, particularly those whose social and academic status is marginal to begin with, feel more threatened than females by the presence of black students.

[Table 6 about here.]

e) Social Status Among Peers

Two measures of social status among peers were devised: a scale of students' self-reported involvement in extracurricular activities, and a scale of students' perceptions of how well liked, known, and respected they were compared to their classmates. Neither scale showed any significant or consistent relationship with attitudes toward the busing program. Each of the variables emerged as predictors in only one or two schools and the relationship in those cases was more likely to be negative than it was positive. Thus the data do not confirm the prediction that students who ranked low in social status among their peers would have more negative racial attitudes than others. A possible explanation is that neither of the two subjective measures was a particularly good index of a student's objective popularity. There is only a weak relationship between perceived and actual popularity, as Spady (1970) discovered, and thus reliance upon perceptions in this matter can be misleading.

Furthermore, information gained through informal interviews with black and white students indicated that black students were likely to be most friendly with those white students who were identified with a hip counter-culture life style. Perhaps hip types do not perceive of themselves as being popular in a conventional sense, since they are consciously non-conformists, and they probably do not participate in traditional school activities. This may help explain why students' perceived social status and their participation in school activities was not significantly related to their racial attitudes. Another possible explanation is that some students may feel popular with one group in their class whose norms are less tolerant than the norms of the majority of their classmates. There is obviously no one monolithic peer culture with one set of norms.

TABLE 6 Attitudes toward Busing Program by Socioeconomic Status, Academic Status and Sex[a]

Favorable Attitudes Toward Busing Program	Socioeconomic Status							
	High				Low			
	Academic Status				Academic Status			
	High		Low		High		Low	
	Sex				Sex			
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
High	45.6%	53.8%	26.4%	41.0%	29.3%	42.7%	18.5%	30.6%
Medium	30.6	30.1	37.3	28.9	30.5	31.8	21.0	34.7
Low	23.7	16.1	36.4	30.1	40.2	25.5	60.5	34.7
	Gamma = -.17		Gamma = -.21		Gamma = -.27		Gamma = -.39	
N	160	186	110	83	82	110	162	144

Total N. 1037

[a]All variables have been standardized to adjust for differences between schools.

f) Prior Interracial Contact

There is a significant independent relationship between previous interracial contact and positive attitudes toward the busing program. The beta coefficient for prior contact in the regression based on the whole sample is .12. Researchers for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1967) have also documented the positive effects on the racial attitudes of adolescents and adults of previous equal status interracial exposure.

g) Classroom Contact with Black Students

The degree to which a white student had shared classes with the black students in the busing program has no relationship with his attitudes toward the program. The simple correlation (r=-.16) between classroom contact and attitudes is a weakly negative but still statistically significant relationship (at the .01 level). However, when other variables are taken into account in multiple regression analyses, the relationship is no longer significant.

These findings are congruent with those of other researchers. Several investigators (Campbell, 1958; Whitmore, 1956; Lombardi, 1963) who conducted longitudinal studies in newly desegregated schools found that students who had classroom contact with blacks were no more likely to express positive racial attitudes after desegregation than other students. Furthermore, McPartland (1968) in his reanalysis of the Coleman data found that interracial contact in the classroom was associated with relatively positive attitudes only for those white students who had made a close black friend. Thus, research results to date indicate that while interracial contact in the classroom does not lead to the development of hostile racial attitudes, the classroom, perhaps because of its competitive atmosphere, does not appear to be a setting conducive to the formation of positive racial feelings either.

However, one clear pattern which does emerge from the data in this survey is that the effects of cross-racial contact in the classroom on attitudes vary for different groups of white students. The data presented in Table 7 show the effects of interaction of such contact and mobility on racial feelings. While increased classroom interracial contact is slightly related to more negative attitudes toward black students among whites who are upwardly mobile or lower non-mobile (low SES and low academic status) and is actually somewhat positively associated with these attitudes among downwardly mobile students, such contact is <u>strongly</u> related to more negative racial feelings among upper non-mobile students (high SES and high academic status). In other words, the impact of cross-racial

contact in the classroom has its most negative effects on those students who otherwise tend to have the most favorable attitudes toward the busing program--those high both in SES and academic status. For example, 61 percent of the students in this group who have low class contact have more favorable attitudes compared to only 36 percent of the students who are in the same mobility category but who have high class contact.[12]

[Table 7 about here.]

Why is it that interracial contact in this particular setting has such a strong negative influence on the racial attitudes of students who are high both in academic status and SES? This is the group which is most tolerant of and least threatened by the presence of black students in the school. One possible explanation is that these students have nurtured idealistic and liberal attitudes in the abstract and have had less actual exposure than others to black students. When they are finally confronted with the reality of cross-racial contact, they may be offended because their liberal but patronizing overtures to black students are sometimes rebuffed or because the black students do not act the way the whites expect them to. Other groups of students, particularly the lower non-mobiles, were possibly more hostile to blacks to begin with--even before school desegregation--so that various degrees of interracial contact would have less differential impact on their attitudes. They perhaps expected little friendship from blacks originally and may have had fewer unrealistic expectations of black students' behavior.

h) Contact with Black Students in School Activities

There is a weak positive relationship between interracial contact in extra-curricular activities and favorable attitudes toward the busing program. The overall beta coefficient is .05 (which is significant at the .08 level). It was hypothesized that contact in activities where students were more likely to be working for common goals (as opposed to contact in the classroom) would be associated with positive racial attitudes. The results tend to support this hypothesis although they fall short of confirming it. Similar results were

---

12. Class contact is defined here as follows:

high - 3 or more interracial classes (since the busing program began)
medium - 2 interracial classes
low - 1 or no interracial classes

TABLE 7 Attitudes Toward Busing Program by Socioeconomic Status, Academic Status, and Classroom Interracial Contact[a]

Favorable Attitudes Toward Busing Program	Socioeconomic Status: High				Socioeconomic Status: Low			
	Academic Status: High		Academic Status: Low		Academic Status: High		Academic Status: Low	
	Class Contact: High	Class Contact: Low	Class Contact: High	Class Contact: Low	Class Contact: High	Class Contact: Low	Class Contact: High	Class Contact: Low
High	35.8%	61.0%	34.8%	25.9%	31.7%	42.9%	24.2%	24.2%
Medium	37.7	24.6	31.9	38.9	36.6	25.3	25.6	31.3
Low	26.5	14.4	33.3	35.2	31.7	31.9	50.2	44.4
	Gamma = -.41		Gamma = .11		Gamma = -.11		Gamma = -.07	
N	151	195	138	54	101	91	207	99
							Total N = 1036	

[a]All variables have been standardized to adjust for differences between schools.

reported by McIntyre (1970) who found that cross-racial association in sports produced more positive racial attitudes among white males.

Summary and Conclusions

The evidence suggests that certain types of interracial contact are associated with the expression of tolerant racial attitudes while other forms of contact have no significant positive correlation with unprejudiced views. In this study, those white students who had experienced equal status contact with blacks prior to the establishment of a busing program in their school and those who had associated with the bused students in school activities were more likely than others to have positive feelings about the busing program. On the other hand, contact with the bused students in the classroom was not related to tolerant attitudes and, in fact, was strongly associated with more negative racial feelings among students who ranked high both in socioeconomic and academic status. These mixed findings with respect to the relationship between students' interracial contact experiences and attitudes suggest that the issue has not been studied with the complexity it deserves.

Furthermore, not only was it evident from the study that interracial contact in school did not necessarily lead to the development of tolerant attitudes, but it was also clear that there were other factors operating on some white students encouraging them to develop and express negative feelings toward their black classmates. In particular, students who came from relatively low socioeconomic backgrounds, or whose academic standing in school was low, or who were male, were significantly more likely than other white students to express feelings of hostility toward the busing program. Students who possessed all three of these characteristics were an especially prejudiced group. The statistical evidence supports the general contention that the negative influence of school and non-school status factors on prejudice are on the whole stronger than the positive effects of cross-racial association.

In light of these findings, it is useful to re-evaluate the role of schools in improving intergroup relations. No doubt the conditions which help create and perpetuate racial prejudice in our society are reflected in schools as well. For example, social class distinctions that have the effect of increasing racial animosities are not reduced in schools. If anything, as Bowles (1972) and others have argued, schools play an important role in preserving the social class stratification hierarchy. Also, recent studies (Epstein, 1970; National Organization

of Women, 1971) have noted that traditional scoietal notions of sex roles, which again can have the effect of heightening racial conflicts, are reinforced in schools. The constricting demands of the female sex role make it particularly difficult for black females to find acceptance in an integrated school.

But schools do not simply reinforce patterns that prevail in society at large. Indeed, it can be argued that some of the academic structures and functions of schools themselves actually create pressures that exacerbate and even generate racist sentiments among students. Schools create a stratification system of their own, ostensibly based on academic ability: students are ranked by their grades and their scores on achievement tests, and are frequently placed in ability groups whose labels connote a certain level of academic performance. The existence of such a stratification system whose rewards are important to a student's future life chances may lead to antagonisms between individuals and groups jockeying for favored positions on that hierarchy. As with the social class stratification system, intergroup hostilities may be fiercest among those whites in the middle or lower sectors of the academic hierarchy who view their own positions as tenuous at best and who perceive that blacks' advances will erode their position even further.[13]

The existence of stratification hierarchies does not necessarily by itself create racial (and social class) antagonisms among those whose status is relatively low. It is the inculcation of certain attitudes which helps set off these resentments. Since schools socialize students who rank low in socioeconomic and academic status in a way that discourages them from developing the class or group solidarity necessary for uniting in a common cause, marginal groups of students may instead focus their hostility on one another. The school's stress on individual competition inhibits students from joining in cooperative efforts where participants seek collective and not simply individual rewards.[14]

---

13. The results of a recent study (Chadwick et al., 1970) of white working class and lower middle class secondary students revealed that those students who feared economic and social competition with blacks in the future were significantly more likely than others to express prejudiced racial attitudes. This finding held up even after a number of other social and psychological factors were taken into account. Also, Greeley and Sheatsley (1971) report that white Protestants and Catholics (except for Irish and German Catholics) who live in integrated neighborhoods were more likely to express racially prejudiced views than their counterparts who lived in unintegrated areas where, presumably, they were not threatened by competition with blacks for jobs and housing.

14. As Dreeban (1968) notes, many forms of cooperation among students on academic matters are considered cheating.

Emphasis on individual competition and the chance of mobility also reduces the possibility of collective rebellion and solidarity among "unsuccessful" students who are socialized to believe that their failure is due to personal incapacities and not an outcome to some extent predetermined by broader social patterns. Miliband (1969:241) put it this way:

> ...The very fact that some working-class children are able to surmount these handicaps [and achieve academic success] serves to foster the notion that those who do not are themselves, because of their own unfitness, architects of their own lowly fate, and that their situation is of their own making. The educational system thus conspires to create the impression, not least among its victims, that social disadvantages are really a matter of personal, innate, God-given and insurmountable incapacity.

It could be argued that as long as students are forced to compete for crucial status rewards and are also taught that their failure is a result of their own personal inadequacies, they will seek scapegoats such as vulnerable minority groups onto which they will vent their hostility and frustration.

It is ironic that the non-college and lower SES white students are actually conforming to accepted norms when they direct their hostilities onto blacks whom they perceive as getting ahead "unfairly" rather than on the whole system of academic incentives and rewards characteristic of schools. After all, they have been taught that it is "unfair" for a student to be given extra attention or compensatory benefits, but it is "fair" for students who get A's to go on to college and eventually make more money in their jobs. In other words, certain kinds of inequalities of opportunity are taught to be unacceptable whereas inequality per se is rationalized as a permissible if not a positive good. Therefore, it is not surprising that disadvantaged white students express hostility toward a group of blacks who appear to receive special treatment rather than toward the system of structured inequality that defines the educational enterprise.

A question then that educational policymakers must deal with is how school environments can be altered so that they promote interracial harmony. No doubt some changes could be made in many schools that would help foster intergroup tolerance without having to make basic alterations in the structure and functioning of the schools. For example, various extracurricular activities could be instituted or expanded that encouraged black and white students to work for common goals in non-competitive arenas of school life. However, there are other forces operating to produce racist sentiments among white students that are much more

difficult to alter because they are so inextricably tied to fundamental values and structures that characterize American society. In particular, social class distinctions which are reinforced in schools as well as academic hierarchies which are created in scholastic settings help perpetuate racial divisions. In this way, schools may serve more to separate groups of students then to bring them together.

This does not mean that racial integration will necessarily produce increased hostility among white students toward blacks. The conclusions reached here are based on a study which was limited in that it was analyzing one particular type of integration program, it did not systematically examine the long range effects of intergroup contact on attitudes, and it did not include a control group of white students attending all-white schools. In fact, the finding that equal status interracial contact in childhood significantly correlated with positive racial attitudes among white adolescents indicates there are long range benefits of racial integration. The important point is <u>not</u> that integrated schools play no role in improving racial attitudes but that some of the ways in which these schools currently function often serve to undercut the full development of tolerant racial feelings.

REFERENCES

Abramson, Harold, and C. Edward Noll.
1966 "Religion, ethnicity, and social change." Review of Religious Research 8(Fall):11-26.

Allport, Gordon.
1954 The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Allport, Gordon, and Bernard Kramer.
1946 "Some roots of prejudice." Journal of Psychology 22(July):9-39.

Armor, David, and Mary Jo Good.
1972 "The Effects of School Integration: Test of a Policy Model." Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, mimeographed.

Bettelheim, Bruno, and Morris Janowitz.
1950 The Dynamics of Prejudice. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Bowles, Samuel.
1972 "Unequal education and the reproduction of the social division of labor," in Carnoy (ed.), Schooling in a Corporate Society: The Political Economy of Education in America and the Alternatives Before Us. New York: David McKay (forthcoming).

Campbell, Angus.
1971 White Attitudes Toward Black People. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Campbell, E. Q.
1958 "Some social psychological correlates of direction in attitude change." Social Forces 36(May):335-340.

Campbell, John, and Marion R. Yarrow.
1958 "Personal and situational variables in adaptation to change." Journal of Social Issues 14(No. 1):29-46.

Carithers, Martha W.
1970 "School desegregation and racial cleavage, 1954-1970: A review of the literature." Journal of Social Issues 26(Autumn):25-47.

Chadwick, Bruce A., H. M. Bahr, and R. C. Day.
1970 "Correlates of racial discrimination among high school students." Paper delivered at the meetings of the American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C.

Coleman, James S.
1961 The Adolescent Society. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Coleman, James S., et al.
1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Dentler, Robert, and Constance Elkins.
1967 "Intergroup attitudes, academic performance and racial composition." Pp. 61-75 in Dentler, Mackler, and Warshauer (eds.), The Urban R's: Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education. New York: Frederick A. Praeger.

Dreeben, Robert.
1968 On What is Learned in School. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

Epstein, Cynthia.
1970 Woman's Place. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gordon, Leonard.
1966 An Acculturation Analysis of Negro and White High School Students: The Effects on Social and Academic Behavior of Initial Close Interracial Association at the Secondary School Level. Ph.D. Dissertation. Wayne State University.

Gottlieb, David, and Warren TenHouten.
1965 "Racial composition and the social systems of three high schools." Journal of Marriage and the Family 27(May):204-212.

Gouldner, Alvin W.
1970 The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology. New York: Basic Books.

Greeley, Andrew M.
1969 Why Can't They Be Like Us? New York: Institute of Human Relations Press.

Greeley, Andrew M., and Paul B. Sheatsley.
1971 "Attitudes toward racial integration." Scientific American 225 (December):13-19.

Greenblum, Joseph, and Leonard I. Pearlin.
1953 "Vertical mobility and prejudice: A socio-psychological analysis." Pp. 480-500 in Bendix and Lipset (eds.), Class, Status, and Power. New York: The Free Press. First edition.

Hadden, Jeffrey K.
1969 The Gathering Storm in the Churches. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Incorporated.

Hollingshead, August B.
1949 Elmtown's Youth. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Incorporated.

Hunt, Chester L.
1959-60 "Private integrated housing in a medium size Northern city." Social Problems 7(Winter):196-209.

Lombardi, D. N.
1963 "Factors affecting changes in attitudes toward Negroes among high school students." Journal of Negro Education 32(Spring):129-136.

Lundberg, George A., and Lenore Dickson.
1952a "Selective association among ethnic groups in a high school population." American Sociological Review 17(February):23-35.

1952b "Interethnic relations in a high school population." American Journal of Sociology 58(July):1-10.

Martin, James G., and Frank R. Westie.
1959 "The tolerant personality." American Sociological Review 24 (August):521-528.

McIntyre, Thomas D.
1970 A Field Experimental Study of Cohesiveness, Status, and Attitude Change in Four Biracial Small Sport Groups. Ph.D. Dissertation. Pennsylvania State University.

McPartland, James.
1968 The Segregated Student in Desegregated Schools. Final Report: The Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools: The Johns Hopkins University.

Miliband, Ralph.
1969 The State in Capitalist Society. New York: Basic Books.

National Organization of Women
1971 "A Report on Sex Bias in the Public Schools." New York: Education Committee, National Organization of Women.

Noel, Donald L., and Alphonso Pinkney.
1964 "Correlates of prejudice: Some racial differences and similarities." American Journal of Sociology 69(May):609-622.

Parsons, Theodore W., Jr.
1965 Ethnic Cleavages in a California School. Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.

Pettigrew, Thomas F.
1958 "Personality and sociocultural factors in intergroup attitudes: A cross-national comparison." Journal of Conflict Resolution 2(March): 29-42.

1969 "The Negro and education: Problems and proposals." Pp. 49-112 in Katz and Gurin (eds.), Race and the Social Sciences. New York: Basic Books.

Porter, Judy.
1971 Black Child, White Child. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Riley, Robert, and Thomas F. Pettigrew.
1969 "Relative deprivation and Wallace's northern support." Paper delivered at the meetings of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, California.

Selznick, Gertrude J., and Stephen Steinberg.
1969 The Tenacity of Prejudice: Anti-Semitism in Contemporary America. New York: Harper and Row.

Singer, Dorothy.
1966 Interracial Attitudes of Negro and White Fifth Grade Children in Segregated and Unsegregated Schools. Ph.D. Dissertation. Teachers College, Columbia University.

1967 "The influence of intelligence and an interracial classroom on social attitudes." Pp. 99-116 in Dentler, Mackler and Warshauer (eds.), The Urban R's: Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education. New York: Frederick A. Praeger.

Spady, William G.
1970 "Lament for the letterman: Effects of peer status and extracurricular activities on goals and achievement." American Journal of Sociology 75(January):680-702.

Stember, Charles H.
1961 Education and Attitude Change. New York: Institute of Human Relations Press.

Tumin, Melvin.
1958 "Readiness and resistance to desegregation: A social portrait of the hard core." Social Forces 36(march):256-263.

United States Commission on Civil Rights.
1967 Racial Isolation in the Public Schools (Volumes I and II). Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

Useem, Elizabeth L.
1971 White Suburban Secondary Students in Schools with Token Desegregation: Correlates of Racial Attitudes. Ed.D. Dissertation. Harvard University.

Whitmore, Paul G.
1956 A Study of School Desegregation: Attitude Change and Scale Validation. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Tennessee.

Williams, Robin.
1964 Strangers Next Door. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Williams, W. L.
1955 A Study of School Desegregation: Self Prediction of Behavior and Correlates of Self Prediction. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Tennessee.

Young, Robert K.
1960 "Changes in attitudes toward the Negro in a southern university." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 60(January):131-133.